UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,852	09/22/2003	Bruce Wallman	CHA920030022US1	1382

45095   7590   04/11/2008
HOFFMAN, WARNICK & D'ALESSANDRO LLC
75 STATE ST
14 FL
ALBANY, NY 12207

EXAMINER
TOLENTINO, RODERICK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2134	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02/29/2008</u>.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>22 September 2003</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1 – 16 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 11 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically teachd or described as set forth
> in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the
> prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention
> was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1 – 4 and 6 – 10are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Sasmazel et al. U.S. Patent No. (6,725,376) in view of Limisco U.S.

Patent No. (6,662,228).

5.   As per claims 1, Sasmazel teaches a logical security system for processing login

and password data received from a client device during a server session in order to

authenticate a user (Sasmazel, Col. 8 Lines 21 – 30, user authentication with user id

and password) and a physical security system for processing Internet protocol (IP)

address information of the client device in order to authenticate the client device for the

duration of the server session (Sasmazel, Claims 1 and 4, IP Address used as

authentication information) but fails to teach the use of an internet server. However, in

an analogous art Limisco teaches use of an internet server (Limisco, Col. 4 Lines 18 –

25, remote authentication by way of a server).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to use Limisco's

Internet server authentication with Sasmazel's method of using electronic ticket and

distributed server because it offers the advantage of securely transferring authorization

data (Limisco, Col. 1 Lines 61 – 67).

6.   As per claim 2 Sasmazel teaches a memory system for storing a list of each

logged in user and a reference IP address collected during a login procedure

(Sasmazel, Claim 4, IP Address used as authentication information).

7.   As per claim 3, Sasmazel teaches wherein the physical security system

compares the IP address of a received message with the reference IP address for the

user (Sasmazel, Claim 4, IP Address used as authentication information).

8.   As per claim 4, Sasmzael teaches wherein the physical security system

terminates the session for the user if the IP address obtained from the received

message does not match the reference IP address for the logged in user (Col. 9 Lines

29 – 35, rejection from web server).

9.   As per claim 6, Sasmazel teaches the physical security system includes a proxy

server module for comparing a portion of an IP address obtained from a received

message against a like portion of the reference IP address for the logged in user

(Sasmazel, Col. 9 Lines 9 – 15, checks validity of eticket).

10.   As per claim 7, Sasmazel teaches storing in a memory system a reference

Internet protocol (IP) address and associated login data whenever a new server session

is initiated on the server from a client device (Sasmazel, Col. 7 Lines 59 – 67, Obtains

IP address of user), receiving a message from a requesting user; obtaining login data

accompanying the message, obtaining an IP address from a message header in the

message, determining if the login data of the requesting user is currently listed in the

memory system as an existing session with the server; and if the login data of the

requesting user is currently listed, determining if the IP address from the received

message matches the reference IP address associated with the login data of the

requesting user (Sasmazel, Claims 1 and 4, IP Address used as authentication

information) but fails to teach the use of an internet server. However, in an analogous

art Limisco teaches use of an internet server (Limisco, Col. 4 Lines 18 – 25, remote

authentication by way of a server).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to use Limisco's

Internet server authentication with Sasmazel's method of using electronic ticket and

distributed server because it offers the advantage of securely transferring authorization

data (Limisco, Col. 1 Lines 61 – 67).

11.   As per claim 8, Sasmazel teaches initiating a login procedure if the login data of

the requesting user is not currently listed in the memory system (Sasmazel, Col. 8 Lines

21 – 30, initiating by obtaining user authentication with user id and password).

12.   As per claim 9, Sasmazel teaches the further step of terminating all server

sessions listed in the memory system having the login data of the requesting user if the

IP address from the obtained message does not match the reference IP address (Col. 9

Lines 29 – 35, rejection from web server).

13.   As per claim 10, Sasmazel teaches examining a portion of the IP address of the

requesting user; and determining if the portion matches a like portion of the reference IP

address (Sasmazel, Col. 9 Lines 9 – 15, checks validity of eticket).

14.   Claims 11 – 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Sasmazel et al. U.S. Patent No. (6,725,376) in view of Limisco U.S.

Patent No. (6,662,228) and Clark et al. U.S. Patent No. (6,442,588).

15.   As per claims 11, Sasmazel teaches a logical security system for processing

login and password data received from a client device during a server session in order

to authenticate a user (Sasmazel, Col. 8 Lines 21 – 30, user authentication with user id

and password) and a physical security system for processing Internet protocol (IP)

address information of the client device in order to authenticate the client device for the

duration of the server session (Sasmazel, Claims 1 and 4, IP Address used as

authentication information) but fails to teach the use of an internet server and to

authenticate the client device during the server session by comparing the IP address of

a received message against the list of IP addresses stored by the server. However, in

an analogous art Limisco teaches use of an internet server (Limisco, Col. 4 Lines 18 –

25, remote authentication by way of a server) and Clark teaches to authenticate the

client device during the server session by comparing the IP address of a received

message against the list of IP addresses stored by the server (Clark, Claim 1,

comparing IP address to list of authenticated IP addresses).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to use Limisco's Internet server authentication with Sasmazel's method of using electronic ticket and distributed server because it offers the advantage of securely transferring authorization data (Limisco, Col. 1 Lines 61 – 67).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to use Clark's method of administering a dynamic filtering firewall with Sasmazel's method of using electronic ticket and distributed server because it offers the advantage of preventing unauthorized access (Clark, Col. 1 Lines 6 – 12).

16.   As per claim 12, Sasmazel teaches a memory system for storing a list of each logged in user and a respective reference IP address collected during a login procedure (Sasmazel, Col. 2 Lines 33 – 40, storage devices for user tickets).

17.   As per claim 13, Sasmazel teaches the means for processing IP address information compares a login name and IP address of a received message against the list of logged in users and their respective reference IP addresses (Sasmazel, Col. 9 Lines 9 – 15, checks validity of eticket, which contains user id password and IP address).

18.   As per claim 14, Sasmazel teaches the means for processing IP address information terminates the session for the user if the IP address obtained from the received message does not match the reference IP address for the logged in user stored in the list (Col. 9 Lines 29 – 35, rejection from web server).

19.   As per claim 16, Sasmazel teaches the means for processing IP address information includes a proxy server module for comparing a portion of an IP address

obtained from a received message against a like portion of the reference IP address for

the logged in user (Sasmazel, Col. 9 Lines 9 – 15, checks validity of eticket).

20.   Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasmazel

et al. U.S. Patent No. (6,725,376) and Limisco U.S. Patent No. (6,662,228) and in

further view of Muratov et al. U.S PG-Publication No. (2003/0097596).

21.   As per claim 5, Sasmazel teaches comparing IP addresses thru comparing

authentication information transmitted and checking to see if the information including IP

addresses match (Sasmazel, Col. 9 Lines 9 – 15, checks validity of eticket), but fails to

teach deleting all instances of the logged in user. However, in an analogous art

Muratov teaches deleting all instances of the logged in user (Muratov, Paragraph 0015).

        At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to use Muratov's

system for protecting data with Sasmazel's method of using electronic ticket and

distributed server because it offers the advantage of protecting data from unauthorized

access (Muratov, Paragraph 0017).

22.   Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Sasmazel et al. U.S. Patent No. (6,725,376), Limisco U.S. Patent No. (6,662,228) and

Clark et al. U.S. Patent No. (6,442,588), and in further view of Muratov et al. U.S PG-

Publication No. (2003/0097596).

23.   As per claim 15, Sasmazel teaches comparing IP addresses thru comparing

authentication information transmitted and checking to see if the information including IP

addresses match (Sasmazel, Col. 9 Lines 9 – 15, checks validity of eticket), but fails to teach deleting all instances of the logged in user. However, in an analogous art Muratov teaches deleting all instances of the logged in user (Muratov, Paragraph 0015).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to use Muratov's system for protecting data with Sasmazel's method of using electronic ticket and distributed server because it offers the advantage of protecting data from unauthorized access (Muratov, Paragraph 0017).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roderick Tolentino whose telephone number is (571) 272-2661. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on (571) 272-3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Roderick Tolentino
Examiner
Art Unit 2134

Roderick Tolentino
/R. T./
Examiner, Art Unit 2134

/Kambiz Zand/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2134